

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

RALPH TURNER CASEY,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) No. 24-cv-2660-SHL-tmp
)
CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF MEMPHIS,)
and SACRED HEART CATHOLIC)
CHURCH,)
)
Defendants.)
)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO COMPEL AND DENYING
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES**

Before the court by order of reference is Defendants' Motion to Compel Answer to Interrogatory No. 8, filed on May 15, 2025. (ECF Nos. 39, 40.) Plaintiff filed a response in opposition on May 29, 2025, in which he states that his "primary opposition is to Defendants' request for attorneys' fees." (ECF No. 41.) On June 18, 2025, the undersigned Magistrate Judge conducted a video hearing. Counsel for all parties were present and heard. At the hearing, Plaintiff stated that he agreed that the discovery sought by Defendants is relevant, proportional to the needs of the case, and is not privileged. He reiterated that his objection was to the request for attorneys' fees.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the court GRANTED the motion to compel and ordered Plaintiff to respond to Interrogatory No. 8 within 20 days from the date of the hearing. The court further ordered that the response to Interrogatory No. 8, as well as follow up discovery relating to that information (such as depositions of the individuals identified in the response to Interrogatory No. 8) shall be governed by a protective order that will be entered by the court. The parties shall submit to the undersigned Magistrate Judge a proposed protective order, which will limit the disclosure of confidential information to only the parties, their lawyers, and their experts; will require the parties to either redact or file under seal these individuals' names and discovery obtained from these individuals; and will require that all such information be destroyed at the conclusion of this litigation. As to Defendants' motion for attorneys' fees, given the unique circumstances of the discovery sought, as well as the lack of bad faith by Plaintiff and his counsel, that part of the motion was DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Tu M. Pham
TU M. PHAM
Chief United States Magistrate Judge

June 18, 2025
Date